Comments Regarding August 21, 2006 Draft Evergreen Policy Statement

Submitted by Michael Hill representative of the San Jose/Evergreen Community College District

These comments are directed specifically to the language recently added to the draft policy regarding development on the college site which on page 12 reads "but may not be allocated for development of a grocery store".

This policy will be the last such area-wide document to direct development in Evergreen for many years to come. To include such restrictive language in a policy document reaching out far into the future is inappropriate and shortsighted. Given the statements of those associated with the Lunardi's and Cosentino's there is a possibility that these markets may not continue for a number of reasons.

The City's own commissioned retail study supports the placement of a grocery store on the College site. The statements of those who spoke in opposition to the grocery store acknowledged that this is the best site for this type of development. To preclude such a development in policy is not in the long term best interests of the community.

The College District plan for development is mixed use incorporating retail/commercial, affordable and market rental housing. Of all the opportunity sites the College plan is the most responsive to the guiding principles of the former Evergreen task force, the current task force and City interests such as creating jobs and affordable housing in the Evergreen area.

As a result the College District plan is more complicated and the various elements yield varying levels of economic return. The retail/commercial piece is the key in the District's ability to even consider affordable housing. Limiting the District's options on the retail/commercial portion of the development could place the entire project in jeopardy.

The College District has reached out to knowledgeable developers to explore alternatives to a grocery store on the site. There have been conversations with representatives of both the Lunardi and Cosentino centers looking for other options with none emerging.

To exclude even considering a grocery store in the development plan increases the difficulty in formulating a development plan that holds together.

We would request that this language be removed from the policy.